

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL BRENT PECTOL, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
BRENT ERNEST PECTOL, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [18-cv-00717-HSG](#)

**ORDER DISMISSING PLAINTIFFS'
COMPLAINT WITHOUT LEAVE TO
AMEND**

On February 22, 2018, the Court denied Plaintiffs' application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, and dismissed Plaintiffs' complaint for failure to state a claim. Dkt. No. 19 at 3 ("Order"). On April 24, 2018, the Court issued a further order, noting that Plaintiffs did not correct the deficiencies that resulted in denial of Plaintiffs' application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Dkt. No. 35 at 1. The Court advised Plaintiffs that, if they wished to proceed with this action, they would have to pay the \$400.00 filing fee within ten days of the date of the Court's April 24 order. *Id.* The Court stated that, if Plaintiffs failed to pay the fee by the deadline, it would close the case.


Plaintiffs did not pay the filing fee by the ten-day deadline (Friday, May 4, 2018). Though Plaintiff Michael Brent Pectol filed an amended complaint on that date, that complaint suffers from the same deficiencies as does Plaintiffs' original filing. *See* Dkt. No. 42. For instance, the amended complaint lists without explanation over two dozen federal statutes as bases for jurisdiction. Plaintiff completes this statutory list with the phrase "etc, etc, etc. . ." Plaintiff then presents what appears to be an online description of some of these statutes, as well as numerous international treaties. As the Court's Order previously explained, these provisions do not provide a private right of action. Order at 2-3. There is similarly no federal cause of action that supports Plaintiff's requested relief, which includes an order ceasing and expunging "[a]ll process"

1 concerning Plaintiffs by “Superior Court Shasta County, Superior Court Humboldt County,
2 Superior Court San Mateo County”; provision of a federal marshal or the “Federal Protection
3 Service. . . as escort and transportation” for several of Plaintiffs from Shasta and San Mateo
4 counties to the “French Consulate in Los Angeles”; and the issuance of restraining orders in
5 relation to these processes. Plaintiff again estimates the amount of controversy to be
6 \$40,011,888,000,000,000.00. The amended complaint does not provide a factual basis for this
7 amount, other than presenting it as an “estimate[] for international involvement and advocacy.”

8 The above referenced portions of the amended complaint exemplify a continued inability
9 to state a legally cognizable claim for relief. For the reasons set forth in the Court’s orders of
10 February 22 and April 24, the Court **DISMISSES** Plaintiffs’ complaint **WITHOUT LEAVE TO**
11 **AMEND**. The clerk is directed to enter judgment in accordance with this order in favor of
12 Defendants and to close the case. The Court will not accept or review any further submissions in
13 this closed case, and Plaintiffs are advised that emails or any other communications to Court staff
14 will not be read.

15 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16 Dated: 5/7/2018

17 
18 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
United States District Judge